

Joint George Mason/Mary Ellen Henderson Campus Steering Committee

MINUTES

AUGUST 21, 2014

7:30AM

FCCPS SCHOOL BOARD OFFICE

IN ATTENDANCE	
	David Tarter, Mayor (DT) David Snyder, Vice Mayor (DS) Susan Kearney, School Board Chair (SK) John Lawrence, School Board Member (JL) Ruth Rodgers, Planning Commission Chair (RR) Michael Novotny, EDA (MN) Wyatt Shields, City Manager (WS) Toni Jones, Superintendent of Schools (TJ)
OTHERS PARTICIPATING	[REDACTED] Susan Bell, Consultant (SB) Doug McCoach, RTKL (DM) (remote)
DOCUMENTS/ RESOURCES	
INVITED GUESTS	RTKL – Doug McCoach,

Agenda

3A: 7:30AM	Committee Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Rules of Procedure (Committee Spending) Review Planning and Budget Document (Calendar of Events)
3B: 8:00AM	RTKL Presentation of Findings
3C:	Ongoing Project / Action Item Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ULI/TAP ALTA Survey Report on Additional Expertise Needed as Determined by City Staff
3D:	Set Agenda for 9/4/14 meeting.

Discussion and Recommendations (By Speaker)

Agenda	Speaker	
3A	SK	Rules of Procedure
	TH	
	DS	The comm chairs may allow public comment at SC meetings.
	DT	(move up) – Concerned with the formality of the comment.
	TH	Recommended that SC formally adopt the Rules of Procedure.
	JL	Mo – RR 2 nd – 5-1 (DS, too restrictive on public comment)
	TJ	Presentation/explanation of Planning and Budget Document which includes projected calendar of events.
	DT	What is the role of Arcadis?
	MN	How is Arcadis contract set up? Fixed fee? Hourly?
	TJ	Contract was presented with the RTKL documents (find meeting date)
	WS	Description of ULI-TAP
	MN	Will we need additional money to have RTKL participate with ULI-TAP
	DM	RTKL considers their participation vital and is participating as part of their original contract. There is no additional fee.
	TJ	Discussion of Project 3 -
	RR	How many community “inputs” would we want?
	TJ	Response to RR – one of the reasons we need a consultant is to help us map out the effort to receive very broad input from the entire community.
	SK	Is this Project 3 a school vision, or also economic development.
	WS	Views the economic development side as being managed by the City staff separately but in concert with project 3.
	SK	Expressed concern that bifurcating the visioning process is problematic.
	MN	Potentially these projects are on two very different timelines and he would recommend keeping them separate.
	DT	Would like to remove the date. Concerned that we will not be prepared to open that up in 6 weeks.
	DS	Action Item – City needs to get moving to determine what expertise is needed on the economic

		development side.
	DT	Do we need to get an ALTA survey done?
	WS	Reviewing the plans from MEH construction to determine suitability but believes it will provide a good base and additional survey needs should be minimal.
	DT	Will the SC review RTKL prior to September 16?
	DS	Will it be appropriate to close that session? Must be carefully considered, doesn't think it is appropriate.
	SK	The September 16 is too aggressive. (Remove from calendar).
	DS	How soon can City staff be ready with additional needs to get the economic development piece moving forward.
	WS	City staff's resources are going to ULI-TAP currently and the recommendations would flow from that process.
	MN	Suggestion that September 16 stay on calendar but limit presentation to school planning and "site" of economic development.
	SK	Does that mean spring before we are ready?
	WS	
	DT	"Market value" study is not most critical. Complimentary uses and idea of what kind of uses are valuable and desirable, what kind of money would uses throw off, what kind of density – more important questions than "what is it worth". Suggest we can move forward before spring with those kinds of questions.
	JS	Would want to develop RFP based on what we learn, like, or do not like, about the ULI-TAP study.
	DT	Second DS, City staff can start bringing proposed contractors/experts/consultants to next meeting.
	WS	Revisit the timing and content of September 16.
	DM	Recommendations that may develop – move non-academic uses off site Described some alternatives that don't meet 30% but ultimately it is clear that some vertical construction is essential to recoup more land for ED. ALTA Survey - (discussion of fee sale to WMATA for roadways)
	DT	Would like to consider the details of the WMATA roadways. We can relocate the water easement (WS – confirmed that, we would pay for relocation).
	DM	Recommends traffic study. Consider Other ways to access site will be a recommendation.
	DT	Recommends showing straight line distance (pg 11) to north side of WMATA garage.
	MN	We should not take liberty to show ped access across the UVa site. We should show line up to Haycock.
	DM	
	DT	Can all athletic fields be placed above parking decks?
	DM	
	JL	Questioned the economic potential across broad
	JS	Clarified Fx County's recent decisions downgrading development on the south side of Broad St.
	MN	Questioned whether 75' as shown can be changed, without having a lesser school. Described other projects as 110' – 120' to reduce the height potentially. (page 24)
	DT	Re pg 25 – would prefer an option that flips the economic acreage to provide more on Metro side and less on Haycock.
	SK	Thanked DM.
	TJ	Concerns about bus parking because it is not shown and we cannot lose site of that need especially as the fleet grows.
	DT	Would like information about extra levels of parking – how many spaces per level, cost, configurations, etc.
	DM	RTKL can provide some of that information.
	DT	Can we get a surface parking number from adjacent properties?
	MN	Referencing page 6, and placement of commercial development. Potentially 20 acres of TOD development when our property combined with WMATA.
	DT	Response to MN – begs the question about density analysis, and the synergy between adjacent sites and what brings more value. We need to have that consultant on board to provide that analysis.
	MN	Can Mayor go to high-level WMATA folks with this concept?
	JC	If the HS enrollment went to 2,000 what options would be available?
	DM	It would present enormous challenges. For the purposes of this study we are fairly well maxed out.
	SK	Response to JC – at that number, new land options would have to be considered.
	JC	To the extent we get into parking business in order to unlock value in Fairfax, what good does that do Falls Church?
	DT	Conversations with Federal Realty will be important to see the future synergy options for them. Do they exist?
	JL	Is there a restriction in UVa agreement about sharing spaces?
	JS	In addition to UVa, there is a potential synergy with community colleges that does not exist elsewhere.
	DT	Would like to know more about the road through the middle.
	JS	We can reapply for COG grant for traffic study in the spring.
	DT	Will reach out to Mary Hines, WMATA.
	SK	Can DM describe the deliverable with regard to economic development.
	DM	Suggest sites, describe access points, propose complimentary uses, and range of uses, take swags at types of yields. Not a recommendation for specific uses.
	SB	The scope described by DM would be very helpful to the ULI-TAP study. She would see them taking it further.
	DT	Maximum density to achieve in these categories. (in quotes) -
	MN	Helpful if RTKL can test fit – typical building footprints for office/residential, agnostic to number of stories and density, how the road network works. Prefers the use of "test fit".

	DT	"Test fit" not an economic analysis.
	WS	From a yield perspective, academic use is not likely to be a high yield.
	DT	Consensus of group is that RTKL proceed with a "test fit".
	JS	Planning Commission and City Council preference and vision for density on west end, Gordon Road.
	WS	September 4, will we be able to have the "test fit".
	DM	September 4 will be final draft of school planning and initiate the test fit only. September 16 should be site analysis and school only.
	MN	Would like to have SC be involved in ED dialogue going forward.
	SK	Please forward/funnel requests for information, etc through staff (TH).
		JL to adjourn. RR to adjourn.

Action Items

Item	Assigned to:	Date Assigned
Develop additional "review" / approve language options for operating procedures.	WS/TJ	7/14/14
Contact UVa/VaTech and engage them by inviting to 8/21/14 meeting.	WS	8/14/14
Determine additional expertise needed (commercial, transportation, etc).	CITY STAFF	8/14/14
Invite Supervisor Foust (or staff) to attend 8/21/14 meeting.	JL	8/14/14
Commission ALTA Survey	CITY STAFF	8/14/14
Agenda's need public comment periods		

 Task Completed  In Progress From Previous Meetings

Potential Action Items (Discussed, not designated)

Item	Assigned to:	Delivery